

## REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 180-215 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended. Claims 168-179 have been cancelled. Claims 180-215 have been newly added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and the following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

### DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as allegedly being incomplete. In particular, the Examiner has requested that Applicants "submit the necessary drawings that illustrate . . . 'a tracking identification string allocation module' and a 'tracking number request module,'" as recited in previously pending claim 168.

Applicants note that previously pending claim 168 has been cancelled as indicated above, and therefore the objection to the drawings has been rendered moot for at least the reason that currently pending claims 180-215 do not recite the language that forms the basis for the objection to the drawings. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection to the drawings.

### SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) as allegedly "failing to provide proper antecedent basis" for the terms "tracking identification string allocation module," "tracking number request module," and "USPS delivery confirmation code," as recited in previously pending claims 168 and 177-178.

Applicants note that previously pending claims 168 and 177-178 have been cancelled as indicated above, and therefore the objection to the specification has been rendered moot for at least the reason that currently pending claims 180-215 do not recite the language that forms the basis for the objection to the specification. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection to the specification.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

The Examiner has rejected claim 179 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Applicants' original specification lacks support for the term "wherein the unique tracking identification string is a USPS delivery confirmation code," as recited in previously pending claim 179.

Applicants note that previously pending claim 179 has been cancelled as indicated above, and therefore the rejection of claim 179 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been rendered moot for at least the reason that currently pending claims 180-215 do not recite the language that forms the basis for the rejection. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of the claims.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

The Examiner has rejected claims 168-179 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleges that "it is still unclear whether Applicants are claiming the subcombination of a 'vendor-controlled centralized postage-issuing computer system' or the combination of a 'vendor-controlled centralized postage-issuing computer system', plurality of end user computers, and a "USPS computer system."

Applicants note that previously pending claims 168-179 have been cancelled as indicated above, and therefore the rejection of claims 168-179 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been rendered moot for at least the reason that the features recited in currently pending claims 180-215 fully address the basis for the rejection. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of the claims.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 168-179 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,527,178 to Gordon et al. ("Gordon") in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,996,546 to Giles et al. ("Giles"), and has further rejected claim 177 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Giles in view of alleged Applicants' Admitted Prior Art.

Applicants note that previously pending claims 168-179 have been cancelled as indicated above, and therefore the rejection of claims 168-179 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been rendered moot for at least the reason that the rejected claims are no longer pending. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of the claims.

### **NEW CLAIMS 180-215**

As indicated above, claims 180-215 have been newly added in the foregoing Amendment. For at least the reason that Applicants believe that Gordon, Giles, and the alleged Admitted Prior Art, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature recited in newly added claims 180-215, newly added claims 180-215 are allowable over the references relied upon. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing objections and rejections raised by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. As such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: August 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Syed Jafar Ali

Registration No. 58,780

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, Virginia 22102

Main: 703-770-7900

Direct: 703-770-7540

Fax: 703-770-7901